

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE - AGENDA

March 9, 1982

UU 220

3:00 PM

Chair, Tim Kersten
Vice Chair, Ron Brown
Secretary, Harry Sharp

I. Minutes

II. Announcements

III. Reports

Administrative Council (Brown)
CSU Academic Senators (Hale, Weatherby, Riedlsperger)
Foundation Board (Kersten)
President's Council (Kersten)

IV. Committee Reports

A. Budget (Conway)	H. General Education and Breadth (Wenzl)
B. Constitution and Bylaws (Rogalla)	I. Instruction (Gooden)
C. Curriculum (Butler)	J. Long Range Planning (Simmons)
D. Distinguished Teaching Award (Ruehr)	K. Personnel Policies (Murray)
E. Election (Mosher)	L. Personnel Review (Brown)
F. Faculty Library (Barnes)	M. Research (Dingus)
G. Fairness Board (Rosenman)	N. Student Affairs (Scriven)

V. Business Items

A. Resolution on Promotion Policies (Murray) (Second Reading)

B. Resolution on the Academic Calendar (Simmons) (First Reading)

C. Resolution on the Faculty Professional Record Form (Brown) (First Reading)

D. Resolution on the Curriculum Process (Butler) (First Reading)

E. Resolution on Honors at Graduation (Scriven) (First Reading)

F. Resolution Concerning the Administration's Handling of Enrollment Targets and Faculty Allocations for 1982-1983 (Conway) (First Reading)

RESOLUTION ON PROMOTION POLICIES

Background: Currently, and during the past several years, the University has not been provided with funds sufficient to promote all who, based on merit, are so recommended. We cannot control the funding available to us. Consequently, decisions must be made regarding which of the recommended promotions are funded. CAM heretofore has not addressed this issue. It does prescribe procedures for retention, tenure and promotion (i.e., how promotions are recommended), but does not provide procedures for ranking those recommended for promotion. The Personnel Policies Committee was charged with the duty to develop procedures for ranking candidates recommended for promotion.

WHEREAS, CAM does not specify a procedure for ranking candidates recommended for promotion; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the procedures described in CAM Section 342.2.B.2 Items (a) through (j) be replaced by the following procedures.

342.2.B.2 (a) - (j)

2. Procedures Used in Applying Promotion Factors

(a) Primary Level Committee (PLC)

The primary level of evaluation is either the department or an equivalent level in the case of schools or divisions not subdivided into departments. The primary level committee shall consist of the department head and all tenured members of the department, or an elected committee of same, having rank higher than that of the person eligible for promotion. The PLC shall elect a member as chairperson. Because the primary evaluation represents the best professional judgement by members of the candidate's own discipline, it shall be accorded the most significance.

Each year the PLC will recommend for or against promotion those members of the department who are eligible and who request consideration for promotion. The recommendation will be based on the promotional factors listed in CAM 342.2.B.1. It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit evidence of meeting these criteria.

The PLC will write the reasons for its recommendations, both favorable and non-favorable, which will be signed by committee members. The recommendations may be unanimous or the majority opinion of the committee members. In those instances where the PLC recommendation represents a majority opinion of the committee members, the filing of a minority recommendation by individual members of the committee is permitted and encouraged.

Since professional improvement is one goal of this evaluation process, the department head and the chair of the PLC, if other than the department head, will discuss the content of the evaluation with each candidate. A faculty member who is

not recommended for promotion by the department or the PLC shall be invited (in writing) to discuss the negative recommendation with the department head and the PLC chair.

In addition to recommending on promotion for each candidate, the PLC shall rank those recommended for promotion on the basis of relative merit.

The committee shall separately rank persons recommended from assistant to associate professor, and from associate to professor. The department shall establish its own ranking procedures according to CAM 341.1.C.

By February 10, the department head will submit to the dean the PLC written recommendations, favorable or unfavorable, for each candidate evaluated, and rank order for persons recommended for promotion from assistant to associate professor and from associate to professor. To insure consideration, minority recommendations and individually signed statements by members of the PLC shall accompany the majority recommendation at the time it is forwarded to the dean.

(b) Secondary Level Committee (SLC)

The secondary level committee shall consist of the school dean and one member of professor rank from each department within a school elected by department tenured and probationary, academic rank employees. The Dean shall be chair of the SLC. In the event a department does not have a tenured member of professor rank, a member of associate rank may be elected, but without eligibility to vote and/or deliberate on candidates being considered for promotion to professor. Members shall serve for two-year, staggered terms. Consecutive terms are permitted. The secondary level committee shall review the PLC recommendations to insure there is sufficient evidence to support the PLC recommendations and rankings. Where such evidence is inadequate, the SLC shall provide a statement to the PLC with a request for additional evidence. The PLC shall have five working days to respond to the SLC's request for additional evidence.

The SLC will recommend for or against promotion based on the promotional facts listed in CAM 342.2.B.1. and approved school criteria. The SLC will write the reasons for the recommendations on each person considered for promotion. The recommendations of the SLC shall be signed by committee members. The recommendations may be unanimous or by majority vote of the committee members. Where the SLC recommendation is only the majority vote of the committee members, the filing of a minority report by members of the committee not voting with the majority is permitted and encouraged.

If the individual is not recommended for promotion by the SLC, but is recommended by the PLC, the school dean or division head shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision with the dean and SLC, and submit additional information. When

the school dean or division head disagrees with the PLC's recommendation, a copy of the recommendation shall be sent to the faculty member.

After considering all persons for promotion within the school or division, the SLC shall meet and rank order all persons recommended for promotion. Rank order position of each person recommended for promotion shall be based on the promotion factors in CAM 342.2.B.1. and approved school criteria, and the SLC shall write reasons for the ranking. In ranking persons recommended for promotion, the SLC shall rank persons recommended for promotion from assistant to associate professor, and shall rank persons recommended for promotion from associate to professor. Any change in relative ranking among faculty from one department shall require a written explanation.

The recommendations of the PLC and SLC, along with all appropriate documentation and minority reports, shall be sent to the University President, via the Vice President for Academic Affairs, by March 10.

- (c) The Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate shall commence their review, according to CAM 341.1.A., by March 15.
- (d) Review of recommendations shall be forwarded from the Personnel Review Committee by May 10 to the President or designee.
- (e) Notices of faculty promotions are sent by the University President by June 1.

342.2.B.3. Allocation of Funds

Funds for promotion are provided by the state according to a formula based on the salary required for promotion of all eligible candidates. In the event that the promotion funds so provided are not adequate to promote all recommended candidates, then the following procedures shall be implemented:

The state fractional allocation (SFA) shall be computed by dividing the amount of budget allocations, as obtained from the state based on the state usage base formula, by the amount required to promote all eligible candidates. The promotion funds so obtained by the University shall be divided into two separate funds, namely that for promotion from assistant to associate professor (associate fund) and that for promotion from associate to professor (professor fund). The division shall be based on the SFA as applied to the salary requirement for promotion of all eligible candidates in each of the two above categories in each school.

Promotions will be made in each school and in each category in the order of ranking as determined by the ranking process described in CAM 342.2.B.2. Funds which are insufficient to fund an entire position in each category, and any unused funds due to a lack of recommended candidates in either category will be allowed to be pooled within each school in order to promote the next person or persons in either category.

Remaining funds in each school insufficient to fund an entire position and unused funds from each school, will be returned to a common University pool. These funds will then be used to fund the promotion in any school which needed the least additional funds for promotion of a candidate prior to the funds being returned to the University pool.

In the event that more than one position qualified for these additional returned funds, priority shall be given to the promotion to the associate professorial level.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-129-82/LRP
February 23, 1982

RESOLUTION ON THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

WHEREAS, The early semester academic system provides substantial advantages for students:

- a. there is better access to summer jobs with a spring term ending in May;
- b. because of decreased pressure, there is more time available for participation in student affairs, cultural activities, co-curricular activities, and intramural sports;
- c. course subjects can be explored in greater depth, with time not just for gathering information, but for analysis and synthesis as well;
- d. there is more time at the beginning of a term to get into a subject, and more at the end to review course work before exams (dead week);
- e. there is less pressure to choose a research topic or term paper subject in a hurried and uninformed way, and more time for substantive library and laboratory investigations;
- f. there is more time to do collateral readings and more time for reflection on them;
- g. less time proportionately is spent in taking exams and more in learning;
- h. there is a significant reduction in administrative procedures and red tape involving add/drop, CAR, schedules, grades, etc., with a consequent reduction in the possibility for error; and

WHEREAS, The early semester academic calendar system provides substantial advantages for faculty:

- a. there is more time to get to know individual students, to structure class material to meet individual needs, and to grade more perceptively;
- b. there is more time to develop subject material, to allow application of the information, and to reinforce it throughout the course;
- c. there is less pressure and more time to prepare ahead for lectures;

- d. there is more time at the beginning of a course to develop essential rapport with students and to establish a common set of expectations and language;
- e. less time proportionately is spent in testing and more in teaching;
- f. the possibility exists for giving a more meaningful midterm grade for student guidance;
- g. because there is more lead time for planning and preparation, there can be more varied instructional methods, including speakers, films, and teaching aids of all kinds; and

WHEREAS, The early semester academic calendar system provides substantial advantages for administrators:

- a. there are reduced costs in administering a two-term academic year;
- b. there is improved articulation with other components of California's higher education system (86 to 104 community colleges use a semester system; as do eleven of nineteen universities, and, after 1983, U.C. Berkeley) and with other universities across the nation (55% use a semester system, 48% the early semester);
- c. with more lead time, there can be more accurate and complete schedules and bulletins;
- d. less time proportionately is spent in starting up and concluding terms and more in administering programs; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the university calendar be converted to the early semester; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a fully-funded summer term be continued; and be it further

RESOLVED: That savings derived from operating the new calendar be used for improvement of instruction.

RESOLUTION ON FACULTY RESUMES

Background

In October, 1981, President Baker sent the Faculty Professional Record Form to the academic senate for study and recommendation at the same time that it was forwarded to all faculty subject to personnel actions to be included in personnel files. In the discussions that followed, it was expressed that each faculty member needs to update his/her personnel file when applying for personnel action consideration and that a well prepared resume is essential to the careful review of the file. Legitimate concerns were raised, however, regarding the advisability of using standardized resume forms - either within a school or university wide.

The pertinent C.A.M. section (342.2.A.2) requires that faculty submit resumes (in a format that the dean may prescribe) and deals with how promotion consideration is initiated.

C.A.M. Section 342.2.A.5:

Only those technically eligible faculty members who request consideration by a date specified by the school dean shall be evaluated for promotion. Such faculty members requesting promotion consideration shall submit a resume or supplementary statement of experience and accomplishments which demonstrates evidence of promotability (i.e. merit and ability) to those involved in the evaluation process. The resume or supplementary statement shall be presented in a format prescribed by the dean or the school statement of criteria for personnel actions. This material shall become a part of the faculty member's personnel file.

This resolution proposes a separation of the procedure for initiating a promotion consideration from the resume requirement, better delineation of the responsibilities of the dean and faculty member, and a process by which a professional resume can be generated without some of the problems inherent in a standardized resume or professional record form.

WHEREAS, it is appropriate to request faculty to update their files and professional resumes for the purposes of personnel action review, and

WHEREAS, a wide range of professional activities are appropriate to be included in the files and in resumes - and should be suggested to faculty, and

WHEREAS, use of a standardized form which includes an appropriately large number of categories of professional activity may lead some faculty to diversify their activities rather than make sustained and significant contributions in those areas in which they have special talent and interest, and

WHEREAS, a university or school standardized form has the potential for being inappropriately used as a quick comparison of faculty to determine relative merit which could then enhance the perception that it is the number and not the quality of the entries that matters,

therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the academic senate recommends that C.A.M. Section 342.2.A.5 be replaced by:

5. The dean of each school shall notify all faculty who are eligible for promotion consideration by the beginning of the academic year in which they are eligible. Only those technically eligible faculty members who submit a written request to the school dean for promotion consideration by a date specified by the school's statement of personnel action procedures shall be evaluated for promotion.

To assist each faculty member in preparing his/her resume, the dean of each school shall forward a copy of the policy statement requiring an updated resume (C.A.M. 342.2.A.6) and a copy of the Faculty Resume Worksheet appearing in Appendix XII at the time of notification of eligibility for promotion consideration.

6. Each faculty member requesting promotion consideration shall update his/her personnel file and submit a resume which indicates evidence of promotability. This resume should include all categories pertinent to promotion consideration: Teaching activities and performance, professional growth and achievement, service to the university and community, and any other activities or interests which indicate professional commitment, service, or contribution to the discipline, department, university, or community.

RESOLVED:

That the existing C.A.M. Section 342.2.A.6 be renumbered 342.2.A.7.

RESOLVED:

That the attached Faculty Resume Worksheet be placed in C.A.M. as Appendix XII .

Appendix XII

FACULTY RESUME WORKSHEET

This worksheet is intended to assist you in preparing your resume. Included are many categories of professional activity which may be appropriate. There may be other activities which should also be included in individual cases. The form of your resume is not prescribed. It might be appropriate to index the entries on the resume to any support material which also appears in your file.

I. BACKGROUND

EDUCATION
CERTIFICATION OR LICENSING
ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE
RELATED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

II. TEACHING RELATED ACTIVITIES

COURSES AND LABORATORIES TAUGHT
NEW COURSE PREPARATIONS
MAJOR REVISIONS AND INNOVATIONS IN EXISTING COURSES
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
SENIOR PROJECTS OR STUDENT RESEARCH SUPERVISED
STUDENT ADVISING
CURRENT INSTRUCTION RELATED PROJECTS
OTHER

III. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITIES COMPLETED
(Be specific, including dates, about activities such as consulting, commissions, patents, copyrights, relationships with business and industry, projects completed, publications, papers presented, reviews, professional workshops offered, professional conferences/workshops attended, etc.)
PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS
GRANTS, CONTRACTS, FELLOWSHIPS, HONORS
CURRENT PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

IV. SERVICE

UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT
COMMUNITY (Only include service which is related to teaching and/or professional activities)

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE CURRICULUM PROCESS

Background: The current 1981-1984 catalog has been approved for extension through the 1983-1984 academic year. The extension, approved by President Baker upon Senate recommendation, was required because of the revision being made to the General Education and Breadth (GE & B) Requirements. Revision of the GE & B Requirements is scheduled for completion December 10, 1982.

- WHEREAS, Revised GE & B requirements will cause curriculum changes; and
- WHEREAS, GE & B requirements revision should be complete prior to curriculum revision; and
- WHEREAS The Academic Senate must complete review of curriculum changes prior to June 1983; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the following schedule be adopted for preparation and review of the next catalog.

SCHEDULE

January 1, 1983 through March 1, 1983

Departments shall review and develop proposals. All approved proposals shall be forwarded to the Department Head. The Department Head shall review and evaluate the proposals and forward all proposals to this appropriate School Curriculum Committee.

March 1, 1983 through April 1, 1983 ✓

The School Curriculum Committee shall consult with the faculty in reviewing and evaluating the proposals. These proposals shall then be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean shall review and evaluate the proposals and forward all proposals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

April 1, 1983 through June 15, 1983

The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall review and evaluate all proposals and forward recommendations to the President. The Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate shall review and evaluate the proposals and forward its recommendations to the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate shall review and evaluate the proposals and forward its recommendations to the President.

June 15, 1983 through August 31, 1983

The President or his/her designee shall review and make the final decisions.

September 1, 1983 through October 15, 1983

The Dean's offices shall proof the catalog layout and submit final copy to the Academic Affairs staff.

October 15, 1983 through May 1984

The manuscript shall be prepared and submitted to the printer. The galley and page proofs shall be checked. The catalog shall be printed, bound, and delivered.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

RESOLUTION ON THE HONORS AT GRADUATION PROGRAM

- WHEREAS, At present, candidates for the various Dean's Lists and candidates for Honors at Graduation are selected by different methods; and
- WHEREAS, Inconsistencies may arise as a result of this difference, namely, students may receive Honors at Graduation but never qualify for the Dean's List; and
- WHEREAS, The method used to arrive at the Dean's List is not susceptible to fluctuations in grading patterns as is the method currently used to select candidates for Honors at Graduation; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorses a program of Honors at Graduation that includes the top 10% of each School's graduating class on that School's Honor Roll and assigns honors as follows:

- Summa Cum Laude: The top 10% of the Honor Roll from each School
- Magna Cum Laude: The next 30% of the Honor Roll from each School
- Cum Laude: The remaining 60% of the Honor Roll from each School